



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,772	12/30/2003	Vladimir Savchenko	6570P068	1051
8791 7590 02/18/2009 BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040				
EXAMINER				
HIGA, BRENDAN Y				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2453				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/18/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/749,772

Applicant(s)

SAVCHENKO ET AL.

Examiner

BRENDAN Y. HIGA

Art Unit

2453

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to Applicant's amendment and request for reconsideration filed on November 26, 2008.

Claims 1-40 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 10-15, 18-22, 25, 28-33 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sharma et al. (US 2003/0204645) ("Sharma").

As per claim 1, Sharma teaches:

Accessing a first logical port ("logical service reference", see ¶0118) defining a first configuration of a service endpoint interface (see ¶0118, "*Deployer 137 may link a service reference to an actual representation and configuration of a corresponding service*", read as accessing a logical port defining a service endpoint interface);

Selecting an item of configuration in the accessed first logical port (see ¶0118, *"endpoint address for service endpoint 555, properties specific to a protocol 535 and underlying transport 540 that may be used by client 510 to communicate with server 530, security information, and type mapping registry information"* read as items of configuration of the service endpoint interface), the configuration information to set one or more of an HTTP proxy, user authentication information, and protocol configuration (see ¶0118, "properties specific to a protocol 535", read as protocol configuration); and providing a value for the selected item of configuration information to define, at least in part, the first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118, *"Deployer may also provide and configure information for the service instance and service endpoint proxies"*, also see ¶0113 wherein the proxy represents a service endpoint interface, i.e. Fig. 5, ref. 555).

As per claim 2, Sharma further teaches providing a HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP) proxy address for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118 "the configuration information may include the endpoint address for service endpoints" and ¶0087 wherein Sharma provides an example of endpoint address as "http://example.com/stockquite", read as an HTTP proxy address)

As per claim 3, Sharma further teaches providing an access address for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118, *"endpoint address for service endpoint 555", read as a access address*).

As per claim 4, Sharma further teach providing the access address being a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118 and ¶0087 wherein Sharma provides an example of endpoint address as "http://example.com/stockquite", read as a URL).

As per claim 10, Sharma further teaches specifying a name for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118 and ¶0087 wherein Sharma provides an example of endpoint address as "http://example.com/stockquite", read as a [URL] name for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface).

As per claim 11 Sharma further teaches on accessing a second logical port (see ¶0115 "Provider 136 may declare the service references in the deployment descriptor...", here Sharma infers that the invention utilizes multiple service references, read as a second logical port) defining a second configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118, "*Deployer 137 may link a service reference to an actual representation and configuration of a corresponding service*", read as accessing a logical port defining a service endpoint interface);

selecting an item of configuration information in the accessed second logical port (see ¶0118, "*endpoint address for service endpoint 555, properties specific to a protocol 535 and underlying transport 540 that may be used by client 510 to communicate with*

server 530, security information, and type mapping registry information" read as items of configuration of the service endpoint interface); and

providing a value for the selected item of configuration information to define, at least in part, the second configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118, "Deployer may also provide and configure information for the service instance and service endpoint proxies", also see ¶0113 wherein the proxy represents a service endpoint interface, i.e. Fig. 5, ref. 555).

As per claim 12, Sharma teaches:

A Web service client (see Fig. 5, ref. 510, ¶0111) having a service endpoint interface to expose a Web service method to a client application (see ¶0112-¶0013, "Once the WSDL document 550 corresponding to the target service is located, the document may be imported by client 510"... "Once imported the WSDL document may be processed by a WSDL-to-Java mapping tool executing in client 130 that generates", inter alia, "a service endpoint interface", read as a web service client having a service endpoint interface for exposing a web service to a client application); and

a processor and logic executable thereon to access a first logical port ("logical service reference", see ¶0118) defining a first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118, "Deployer 137 may link a service reference to an actual representation and configuration of a corresponding service", read as a deployer 137 providing a logical port defining a service interface); and

provide configuration information based on one or more of an HTTP proxy, user authentication information, and protocol configuration (see ¶0118, "properties specific to a protocol 535", read as protocol configuration) for the accessed first logical port to define, at least in part, the first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118, *"Deployer may also provide and configure information for the service instance and service endpoint proxies"*).

As per claim 19, Sharma teaches:

A service endpoint interface to expose a Web service method to a client application (see ¶0112-¶0013, *"Once the WSDL document 550 corresponding to the target service is located, the document may be imported by client 510..."**"Once imported the WSDL document may be processed by a WSDL-to-Java mapping tool executing in client 130 that generates", inter alia, "a service endpoint interface", read as a web service client having a service endpoint interface for exposing a web service to a client application*); and

A logical port ("logical service reference", see ¶0118) implemented between the client application and the service endpoint interface to define a first configuration of the service endpoint interface (see ¶0118, *"Deployer 137 may link a service reference to an actual representation and configuration of a corresponding service"*, read as a deployer 137 providing a logical port defining a service interface between a client application and the service endpoint interface), the logical port to provide one or more of an HTTP proxy, user authentication information, and protocol configuration to set the first

configuration (see ¶0118, "properties specific to a protocol 535", read as protocol configuration).

As per claim 28, Sharma further teaches wherein the Web service method is based, at least in part, on a Web Service Description Language (WSDL) PortType as specified in a WSDL document describing the Web service method (see ¶0069).

Claims 13, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37 and 38 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1-4, 10, 11, 12, 19 and 28 since they recite substantially identical subject matter. Any differences between the claims do not result in patentably distinct claims and all of the limitations are taught by the above cited art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 6, 16, 23, 24, 34 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma et al. (US 2003/0204645) ("Sharma") in view of Omoigui (US 2003/0126136) ("Omoigui").

As per claim 5, Sharma further teaches the configuration information including "security information" see ¶0118, however Sharma does not expressly teach specifying an authentication type for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface.

Nevertheless, authentication type information is typically used in the computer networking art for security purposes. For example, in the same art of web services, Omoigui teaches a system that employs various authentication schemes for providing access to web services, including client certificates over SSL (see ¶0370).

One of skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings of Sharma with the teachings of Omoigui for configuring authentication schemes such as client certificates over SSL for accessing web services. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the accessing of web services by unauthorized clients in Sharma's invention.

As per claim 6, Sharma further teaches the configuration information including "security information" see ¶0118, however Sharma does not expressly teach the use of client certificates for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface.

Nevertheless in the same art as noted above Omoigui teaches a system that employs various authentication schemes for providing access to web services, including client certificates over SSL (see ¶0370).

One of skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings of Sharma with the teachings of Omoigui for configuring authentication schemes such as

client certificates over SSL for accessing web services. The motivation for doing so would have been to prevent the accessing of web services by unauthorized clients in Sharma's invention.

Claims 16, 23, 24, 34 and 40 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 5 and 6 since they recite substantially identical subject matter. Any differences between the claims do not result in patentably distinct claims and all of the limitations are taught by the above cited art.

Claims 7, 17, 35 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma et al. (US 2003/0204645) ("Sharma") in view of Beringer et al. (US 2004/0172555) ("Beringer").

As per claim 7, Sharma does not teach the specific properties specifying a transport guarantee for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface.

However, in the same art of web service configuring, Beringer teaches a system for defining security information for web services. Specifically, Beringer teaches defining security features, including a confidentiality element for a message transmitted to a service provider for securing the message (see abstract and Fig. 4, ref. 46). (read as a transport guarantee feature consistent with the applicant's specification, see page 46 ¶0097 *"In an embodiment, Web service definition 2600 may specify transport guarantee features. For example, Web service definition 2600 may define whether or not data*

integrity and/or data confidentiality are to be supported for the associated virtual interface”).

One of skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings of Sharma with the teachings of Beringer for defining a transport guarantee feature of the service endpoint interface. The motivation for doing so would have been for securing the web service messages within the teachings of Sharma.

Claims 17, 35 and 39 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 7 since they recite substantially identical subject matter. Any differences between the claims do not result in patentably distinct claims and all of the limitations are taught by the above cited art.

Claims 8, 9, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma et al. (US 2003/0204645) (“Sharma”) in view of Brown et al. (US 2004/0199636) (“Brown”).

As per claim 8, Sharma further teaches the configuration information including “security information”, see ¶0118. However, Sharma does not expressly teach the security information including an encryption type for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface.

Nevertheless, encryption type information is typically used in the computer networking art for security purposes. For example, in the same art of web services,

Brown teaches the use of an encryption type, such as the secure socket layer (SSL), for accessing web services (see ¶0043).

One of skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings of Sharma with the teachings of Brown for configuring an encryption type for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a secure connection for accessing web services in Sharma's invention.

As per claim 9, Sharma further teaches the configuration information including "security information", see ¶0118. However, Sharma does not expressly teach the specified encryption type is a Secure Socket Layer protocol based encryption type.

Nevertheless, in the same art as noted above, Brown teaches the use of an encryption type, such as the secure socket layer (SSL), for accessing web services (see ¶0043).

One of skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings of Sharma with the teachings of Brown for configuring an encryption type, such as the SSL protocol, for the first configuration of the service endpoint interface. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a secure connection for accessing web services in Sharma's invention.

Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 8 and 9 since they recite substantially identical subject matter. Any differences between the claims do not result in patentably distinct claims and all of the limitations are taught by the above cited art.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 26, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per applicant's arguments concerning the relationship between the first logical port and the configuration information, as taught by Sharma et al. (US 2003/0204645) ("Sharma"), the examiner respectfully disagrees, since Sharma explicitly discloses in ¶0118, "For example, deployer 137 **may link a service reference to** an actual representation **and configuration of a corresponding service.**"

Furthermore, assuming *arguendo*, that Sharma teaches the configuration information being provided by the deployer, as stated in the applicant's remarks (see page 11), claim 1 merely recites "providing a value for the selected item of configuration information to define, at least in part, the first configuration of the service endpoint interface", the claim does not recite for instance who or what is providing the value for the selected item, so as to differentiate from a deployer providing such information. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRENDAN Y. HIGA whose telephone number is (571)272-5823. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571)272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brendan Y Higa/
Examiner, Art Unit 2453

/ARIO ETIENNE/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457